



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,395	04/10/2006	Michel Seve	272478US0XPCT	4413
22850	7590	01/26/2009	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				EWOLDT, GERALD R
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1644		
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
01/26/2009			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/535,395	SEVE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	G. R. Ewoldt, Ph.D.	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 39-48 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 5/18/05 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment, remarks, and 1.132 declarations of Inventors Seve and Favier, filed 10/22/08, are acknowledged.

Claims 1-38 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions.

Claims 39-46 are under examination.

2. In view of Applicant's amending of the claims to recite a method of detecting type I diabetes the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101, the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 and the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for inadequate written description, have been withdrawn. Note that in view of the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 the declarations of the Inventors have been rendered moot. Specifically, the declarations have been reviewed and found to address the utility rejection, i.e., the general utility of autoantibody assays, and not the remaining and new rejections of this Office action.

3. The drawings are objected to because they are essentially illegible. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. **The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.**

Art Unit: 1644

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 39-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

As set forth previously, the specification disclosure is insufficient to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention as claimed without an undue amount of experimentation. Undue experimentation must be considered in light of factors including: the breadth of the claims, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the level of one of ordinary skill in the art, the level of predictability of the art, the amount of direction provided by the inventor, the existence of working examples, and the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention, see *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) states, "The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the amount of knowledge in the state of the art as well as the predictability in the art." "The "amount of guidance or direction" refers to that information in the application, as originally filed, that teaches exactly how to make or use the invention. The more that is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention, how to make, and how to use the invention, and the more predictable the art is, the less information needs to be explicitly stated in the specification. In contrast, if little is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention and the art is unpredictable, the specification would need more detail as to how to make and use the invention in order to be enabling" (MPEP 2164.03). The MPEP further states that physiological activity can be considered inherently unpredictable. With these teachings in mind, an enabling disclosure, commensurate in scope with the breadth of the claimed invention, is required.

A review of the instant specification reveals nothing about the detection of autoantibodies specific for the proteins of SEQ ID NOS:2 and 7-10, nor even if such autoantibodies even exist. While it is asserted that the ZnT-8 protein of SEQ ID NO:2 might comprise a marker for the β cells of pancreatic islets of Langerhans, even this minimal assertion is not confirmed in the instant specification. First note that in Example 2 only whole pancreas was probed for the expression of ZnT-8 mRNA. Thus, the example is silent regarding β cell-specific expression. In Example 3 only β cells were probed for ZnT-8 mRNA expression, thus, the example is silent regarding whether or not other cells of the pancreas also express the protein. The data of Examples 4-7 are unrelated to the method of the instant claims. Finally note even the data that are provided cannot be interpreted as the figures are essentially illegible.

Accordingly, the skilled artisan would not know how to use the claimed method.

Art Unit: 1644

A set forth in *Rasmussen v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.*, 75 USPQ2d 1297, 1302 (CAFC 2005), enablement cannot be established unless one skilled in the art "would accept without question" an Applicant's statements regarding an invention, particularly in the absence of evidence regarding the effect of a claimed invention. Specifically:

"As we have explained, we have required a greater measure of proof, and for good reason. If mere plausibility were the test for enablement under section 112, applicants could obtain patent rights to "inventions" consisting of little more than respectable guesses as to the likelihood of their success. When one of the guesses later proved true, the "inventor" would be rewarded the spoils instead of the party who demonstrated that the method actually worked. That scenario is not consistent with the statutory requirement that the inventor enable an invention rather than merely proposing an unproved hypothesis."

Applicant's arguments, filed 10/22/08, have been fully considered but are not found persuasive. Applicant argues that, "the Office has admitted, on the Record, that the specification describes ZnT-8mRNA expression in β cells".

No such admission has been made (see the Office action reproduced above). Additionally, even if ZnT-8 mRNA is expressed β cells, said expression teaches nothing regarding the autoantibodies of the claimed method.

Applicant argues the illegible figures must be accepted unless they are formally objected to.

Figures are no longer reviewed by Office draftsman. However, as Applicant appears to conclude that the figures comprising little more than black smears are actually legible, they have been objected to by the Examiner so as to avoid confusion.

As the specification provides no evidence that autoantibodies to the proteins encoded by SEQ ID NOS:2 or 7-10 exist in diabetic patients, or that should such autoantibodies exist that they could be employed in an assay for the detecting of type 1 diabetes, the rejection has been maintained for the reasons of record.

6. The following are new grounds for rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

7. Claims 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s),

Art Unit: 1644

at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter written description rejection.

The specification and the claims as originally filed do not provide support for the invention as now claimed, specifically, a method of detecting type 1 diabetes comprising detecting the presence of autoantibodies specifically targeting the β cells of the pancreatic islets of Langerhans wherein the autoantibodies bind a protein encoded by SEQ ID NOS:2 or 7-10.

Applicant cites paragraphs 34, 35, 2, and 104, and Claim 29 in support.

A review of the cites do not reveal the claimed method. First note that the paragraphs in the specification are not numbered. Assuming that Applicant is referring to the paragraph numbers in the PG Publication of the instant specification, paragraph 34 discloses polynucleotide mutations. Paragraph 35 discloses a protein marker for pancreatic β cells. Paragraph 2 is found in what appears to be the Background section of the specification and discloses that diabetes is a common disease. Paragraph 104 generically discloses "the search for auto-antibodies directed against the protein according to the invention". Claim 29 comprises an improperly multiply dependent "use" type claim that also recites, "the search for auto-antibodies directed against the protein".

Neither independently, nor taken together, do these cites disclose the method of the instant claims.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 39-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, specifically, in Claim 39, "A method detecting Type 1 diabetes" should properly recite, "A method of detecting Type 1 diabetes".

10. No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1644

11. Applicant's amendment or action necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Gerald Ewoldt whose telephone number is (571) 272-0843. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 5:30 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen O'Hara, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0841.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/G.R. Ewoldt/
G.R. Ewoldt, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 1600